

1578

without further punishing Chase by awarding [attorneys] fees and costs." We conclude, however, that the district court did not abuse its discretion in the circumstances of this case.

A court may award costs and "may also award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing party as part of the costs." U.S.C. § 505. Chase is correct in noting that such awards are not to be made as a matter of course but, rather, as a matter of a court's discretion. See *Fogarty v. Fanta, Inc.*, 114 S.Ct. 1023, 1033 (29 USPQ2d 1881) (1994). In exercising such discretion, we have instructed district courts to consider: (1) the motivation of the parties; (2) the objective reasonableness of the legal and factual positions advanced; (3) the need in particular circumstances to advance considerations of competition and deterrence; and (4) any other relevant factor presented. See *Roschewski v. Areta, Aston, Inc.*, 1 F.3d 225, 234 (27 USPQ2d 1678) (4th Cir. 1993).

[4] Chase maintains that he had a reasonable basis to test the legal question of whether animal mannequins are copyrightable and thus he should not be assessed legal fees for doing so. He points to the district court's assessment that the case "presented legal questions that were novel and complex." We agree that if Chase had pursued these legal issues in good faith, an award of attorneys fees would constitute an abuse of discretion. But the record in this case belies the suggestion that Chase maintained his legal position in good faith.

The record shows that Chase adopted a business practice of copying animal mannequins created by competitors, justifying the practice with the claim that animal mannequins are not copyrightable. As a result of this practice he has been sued repeatedly for copyright infringement. At the same time that he was making the contention that animal mannequins are not copyrightable, however, he was applying for copyrights for his own mannequins, affixing copyright notices to them, and warning others that his mannequins are "legally copyrighted" and "any infringement will be vigorously prosecuted." When one of his fish mannequins was found by a court to be not copyrightable — a decision that he now argues vindicates his contention that animal mannequins are not copyrightable — he nevertheless continued to warn the public, "Beware of look-a-likes," and "[d]esperate copy cats [are] working overtime in an attempt to deceive the public and violate the rights of others." (Emphasis added). Moreover, he continued to attach copyright notices to his mannequins to

secure. This finding is simply supported. Under such circumstances, we do not find the district court's award in this case to constitute an abuse of discretion.

For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the district court is

**AFFIRMED.**

U.S. Court of Appeals  
Federal Circuit

In re Alton

No. 94-1495

Decided February 5, 1996

## PATENTS

1. Practice and Procedure in Patent and Trademark Office — Prosecution — Declaration/Affidavits (§110.0913)

Patentability/Validity — Specification — Written description (§115.1103)

Patent examiner erred by viewing declaration of person skilled in art as opinion evidence addressing question of law rather than question of fact, since declaration attempted to shed light on question of whether specification adequately described subject matter of application claim, since that question is one of fact, and since declaration, rather than asserting opinion on patentability of claimed human gamma interferon analog, offers factual evidence in attempt to explain why one of ordinary skill would have understood specification to describe particular analog claimed.

37 USPOQ2

In re Alton

759

## 2. Practice and procedure: Patent and Trademark Office — Prosecution — Declaration/Affidavit (§110.0913)

## Patentability/Validity — Specification — Written description (§115.1103)

Patent examiner erred by dismissing declaration of persons skilled in art without adequate explanation of how declaration failed to overcome prima facie case for rejection on ground that application did not provide adequate written description of subject matter in claim for human gamma interferon analog. Since statement in examiner's answer that specification encompasses substantial number of possible analogs does not refute thrust of declaration, which explained why one of ordinary skill in art would have realized that applicants had possession of one particular analog on their claimed filing date.

Appeal from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Patent application of Norman K. Alton, Mary A. Peters, Yitzhak Tabinski, and David L. Solomon, serial no. 06/483,453, filed April 15, 1983, which is continuator-in-part of application filed May 6, 1983, now abandoned. From decision upholding examiner's rejection of application claim 70 for failure to comply with written description requirement of 35 USC 112, applicants appeal. Vacated and remanded.

Michael F. Borin, of, Marshall, O'Toole, Gerstein, Murray & Borin, Chicago, Ill.; L. H. Rin-Laures, Chicago, and Steven M. Odre, Thousand Oaks, Calif.; Robert R. Cook and Ron K. Levy, Thousand Oaks, for appellants.

Scott A. Chambers, associate solicitor; Nancy J. Link, solicitor; Albin F. Drost, deputy solicitor; and Richard Torpeon, associate solicitor, Arlington, Va., for appellee. Before Michel, circuit judge, Friedman, senior circuit judge, and Schall, circuit judge. Schall, J.

Appellants Norman K. Alton, et al. ("Alton"), appeal the ruling of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board") in Appeal No. 73-3098. In its decision, the Board held that the specification of application serial number 06/483,453 (the "451 application") did not provide adequate written descriptive support for the amino acid sequence of "human gamma" interferon ("IFN- $\gamma$ ") described in claim 70. We vacate

the decision and remand the case to the Board for further proceedings.

## BACKGROUND

IFN- $\gamma$  is a protein secreted by cells in the human immune system to stimulate immunological activity. Patrick W. Gray et al., *Expression of Human Immune Interferon cDNA in E. Coli and Monkey Cells*, 295 Nature 503 (1982). IFN- $\gamma$  is believed useful because it activates macrophages, which are a class of cells in the immune system. Bruce Alberts et al., *Molecular Biology of the Cell* 1545 (1989) (2d ed. 1989). IFN- $\gamma$  is composed of a sequence of 146 amino acids. The complete sequence is divided into four subunits. IFN- $\gamma$  polypeptides containing alterations in the naturally occurring amino acid sequence are called "analogues."

Claim 70 of the '451 application, set forth below, recites an analog of IFN- $\gamma$ :

"Met, des-Cys, des-Cys, des-Cys" IFN- $\gamma$  polypeptide produced by a DNA sequence coding therefor in a recombinant organism, said product having substantially the characteristics of human immune interferon.

(brackets in original). The bracketed words at the beginning of the claim indicate how the claimed IFN- $\gamma$  differs from the natural version of IFN- $\gamma$ . "Met," "Cys," and "Tyr" are abbreviations for three of the twenty amino acids; they stand for methionine, cysteine, and tyrosine, respectively. A positive superscripted number following the abbreviation of an amino acid indicates the position of that amino acid in the 146 amino acid chain that comprises IFN- $\gamma$ . For example, "Tyr<sup>2</sup>" means that tyrosine is the second amino acid in the 146 amino acid chain. The designation "des" preceding the name of the amino acid indicates that that particular amino acid has been deleted and no amino acid has been substituted in its place. Therefore, "des-Cys<sup>1</sup>, des-Tyr<sup>2</sup>, des-Cys<sup>3</sup>" means that the cysteine at position one of the amino acid chain has been removed, as has the

We understand the parties to be in agreement on the facts regarding the technology in this case.

Amino acids, of which there are twenty, are small organic molecules. Benjamin Lewin, *Genes* 71 (1994). Amino acids combine in linear chains to form proteins. *Id.* at 14. A protein is sometimes referred to as a polypeptide.

The 146-amino acid sequence of the IFN- $\gamma$  analog recited in claim 70 is attached to this opinion.

er such cir-  
the district  
institute an

judgment of

996

Patent and  
Interference —  
(0,0913)

rejection —  
(1103)

wing declara-  
opinion evi-  
rather than  
on attempted  
other specifi-  
subject matter  
question is  
ation, rather  
entailability of  
iron analogs.  
pt. to explain  
have under-  
e particular.

1580

In re Alton

37 USPQ2d

tyrosine at position two and the cysteine at position three. A negative superscripted number indicates that an amino acid has been added onto the beginning (the N-terminus) of the IFN- $\gamma$  sequence. Thus, "met-" means that a methionine has been placed at the beginning of the IFN- $\gamma$  amino acid chain.

In sum, the analog of IFN- $\gamma$  recited in claim 70 has two characteristics that distinguish it from the natural version of IFN-IFN- $\gamma$ . First, as "des-tyr", "des-tyr" indicates the first three amino acids — cysteine, tyrosine, and cysteine — of the natural 146 amino acid sequence have been deleted from the claimed IFN- $\gamma$  analog. These three amino acids are located on the fourth subunit ("IF-4") of the complete sequence. Second, methionine has been placed at the beginning of the amino acid sequence of the claimed analog.

The '451 application's specification contains twelve examples of IFN- $\gamma$  analogs. Of these, Example 5 is closest to the analog that is the subject of claim 70. Like claim 70, it discloses deletion of the first three amino acids and placement of methionine at the beginning of the amino acid sequence of IFN- $\gamma$  ("met-", "des-cys", "des-tyr", "des-cys"). Unlike claim 70, however, Example 5 additionally discloses substitution of asparagine — the eighty-first amino acid in the IFN-IFN- $\gamma$  chain — with lysine, another amino acid ("lys"). The eighty-first amino acid is located on the second subunit ("IF-2") of the IFN- $\gamma$  sequence.

II.

The '451 application was filed April 15, 1983. It is a continuation-in-part of a parent application filed on May 6, 1982, and later abandoned. The examiner issued a final rejection of the claims of the '451 application as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and rendered obvious over the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Alton appealed the examiner's final rejection to the Board. On February 28, 1991, the Board reversed the examiner's section 102 and 103 rejections but rejected the claims on the new ground that the specification failed to describe adequately the subject matter of the claims, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. The Board stated: "The closest analog to that claimed herein is described [in Example 5]. This particular analog, though similar to that claimed herein, does not constitute a description of the claimed analog."

Electing further prosecution pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.196(b), Alton submitted to the

examiner, in response to the Board's section 112, ¶ 1 rejection, a declaration by Dr. Randolph Wall (the "Wall declaration"). In due course, the examiner issued a final rejection on the same grounds as had the Board. Alton then requested reconsideration; the examiner denied the request and maintained his rejection ("final rejection").

Alton appealed the final rejection of claim 70 to the Board. The examiner filed his Answer and the Board sustained the section 112, ¶ 1 rejection on June 21, 1994. In its decision, the Board held that "the specific polypeptide of claim 70 was not described in the original specification of application Serial No. 06/483,451." The Board adopted the examiner's dismissal of the Wall declaration, in which the examiner reasoned that the declaration was opinion evidence rather than factual evidence. The examiner stated, "Little weight is given an opinion affidavit on the ultimate legal question at issue." This appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

I.

The issue of whether a patent specification adequately describes the subject matter claimed is a question of fact. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1991). We review questions of fact arising from Board rejections under a clearly erroneous standard. *In re Cavenley*, 761 F.2d 671, 674, 225 USPQ 1, 3 (Fed. Cir. 1985). We review questions of law *de novo*: *Electronic Design & Sales, Inc. v. Electronic Data Systems Corp.*, 954 F.2d 713, 715, 21 USPQ2d 1388, 1390 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

II.

Alton contends that the Board committed clear error in holding that the '451 specification did not describe the subject matter of

When the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences makes a new rejection of an appealed claim, the applicant may ... submit ... a showing of facts ... and have the matter reconsidered by the examiner in which event the application will be remanded to the examiner. The statement shall be binding upon the examiner unless an amendment or showing of facts not previously presented be made which is the opinion of the examiner, overcomes the new ground for rejection stated in the decision. Should the examiner again reject the application the applicant may again appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

\* 37 C.F.R. § 1.196(b) (1994) states:

37 USPO2d

In re Alton

1581

claim 70. Alton additionally argues that the Board erred in failing to give substantial weight to the Wall declaration.

The adequate written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, § 1, provides that "[t]he specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention." (emphasis added).

The adequate written description requirement, which is distinct from the enablement and best mode requirements, serves "to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application relied on, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him; how the specification accomplishes this is not material." *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 262, 191 USPQ 90, 96 (CCPA, 1976). In order to meet the adequate written description requirement, the applicant does not have to utilize any particular form of disclosure to describe the subject matter claimed, but "the description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (citation omitted). Put another way, "the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention." *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.2d at 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d at 1117. Finally, we have stated that "[p]recisely how close the original description must come to comply with the description requirement of section 112 must be determined on a case-by-case basis." *Eli Lilly & Co. v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1576, 224 USPQ 409, 413 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The best mode requirement mandates that the inventor disclose the best mode known to him or her at the time the patent application is filed. *Speckhard v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 127 F.2d 1524, 1535, 34 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quoting *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.2d at 1561, 19 USPQ2d at 1116).

<sup>3</sup>In order to be considered enabling, a patent must give persons of ordinary skill in the relevant art enough information to practice the invention disclosed in the specification without undue experimentation. *Alton Powder Co. v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1576, 224 USPQ 409, 413 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The best mode requirement mandates that the inventor disclose the best mode known to him or her at the time the patent application is filed. *Speckhard v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 127 F.2d 1524, 1535, 34 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quoting *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.2d at 1561, 19 USPQ2d at 1116).

As noted above, following the Board's decision of February 28, 1991, Alton elected further prosecution pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.196(b). In that context, Alton submitted the Wall declaration in response to the Board's section 112, § 1 rejection. In paragraph 97 of his declaration, Dr. Wall addressed the issue of whether Example 5 in the specification described what was claimed in claim 70.

3. The specific modifications of subunit IF-4 for deleting both cysteines and the intermediate tyrosine at amino acid positions 1, 2, and 3 are set out at page 50; lines 11 and 12, which describe modification of the IF-4 subunit (which contains a methionyl residue specifying codon at position -1) to contain the codons,

5'-ATG-CAG-3'  
3'-TAG-GTC-5'

in the amino acid specifying region: ATG is a codon specifying methionine; CAG is a codon specifying glutamine. Expression of a complete, four subunit, DNA sequence with this modification in subunit IF-4 operatively provides a polypeptide of claims 70. . . . It is my opinion that a skilled worker in molecular biology and the cloning and expression of genes, would, in 1983, have understood the proposed modification (des-tyr, des-cys, des-cys) to have been described independently of any suggestion to alter the arginine [sic; asparagine] residue at position 81 of mature human immune interferon. While the specific analog including both the changes in the mature human immune interferon was described as being made and tested, that compound was noted to be an "example" of polypeptide analogs wherein cysteines were deleted for the purpose of facilitating isolation of analogs by destroying the possibility of intramolecular disulfide bridge formation. Modifying the residuum at position 81 would have no effect on this property because neither arginine [sic; asparagine] nor lysine can bond back on itself. Id.

<sup>4</sup>The parties do not dispute that Dr. Wall has the requisite skill in the art.

<sup>5</sup>We understand the parties to be in agreement that recitation in the Wall declaration of the amino acid "arginine," instead of "asparagine," was a typographical error.

<sup>6</sup>Cysteines contain a sulfur function. The sulfur atom of a cysteine in an amino acid chain can bond to the sulfur atom in a second cysteine at another location in the same amino acid sequence. Benjamin Lewin, *Genes*, 27-14 (1994). The resulting cysteine-cysteine bond, known as a disulfide bridge, causes the amino acid chain to bond back on itself. Id.

1582.

In re Alton

37 USPQ2d

participate in disulfide bridge formation. Moreover, changing to [sic] residue at position 81 would involve a modification in subunit IF-2, requiring an entirely separate series of manipulations of the complete DNA sequence to generate this different class of analog.

Among other things, the Wall declaration states that one of ordinary skill in the art in 1983 would have known, first, that a problem involved with isolating analogs was the capacity of the amino acid sequence to form bonds with itself through disulfide bridges, and second, that deletion of cysteines would eliminate this phenomenon. According to Dr. Wall, one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the discussion in the specification of Example 5 to be offered as an illustration of the deletion of cysteines. Therefore, according to Dr. Wall, one of ordinary skill in the art, knowing that deleting the first three amino acids of the complete sequence would allow disulfide bridge formation but that the existence of lysine at position 81 would not, would have understood the specification to describe the two modifications independently. Also according to Dr. Wall, a second reason one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the specification to describe the two modifications independently is that the first three amino acids are located on subunit IF-4, whereas the eighty-first amino acid is located on subunit IF-2.

In his final rejection, which was adopted by the Board, the examiner stated that the specification did not convey that Alton had possession of the subject matter of claim 70 as of April 15, 1983 — the filing date of the '451 application. In support of the rejection, referring to Example 5, the examiner asserted that the only example in the specification that described deletion of the first three amino acids and placement of methionine at the beginning of the amino acid sequence of IFN- $\gamma$  additionally described substitution of asparagine — the eighty-first amino acid in the IFN- $\gamma$  chain — with lysine, another amino acid. Turning to the Wall declaration, the examiner stated:

In order to support patentability of the claims Dr. Wall points to the same text of the specification as previously identified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences as being insufficient. Importantly, Dr. Wall arrives at a conclusion which is opposite that determined by the Board.

In view of the previous discussion of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer-

ences and the evidence of record, this argument is not found to be persuasive.

The weight given to the 132 Declaration by Dr. Wall, in particular paragraph 93, depends on whether it presents allegations, opinions or facts. In this case the Declaration does not point to inherent support or evidence to support the conclusory statement in paragraph 93. Little weight is given an opinion affidavit on the ultimate legal question at issue.

In short, the examiner rejected Dr. Wall's opinion that "a skilled worker in molecular biology and the cloning and expression of genes, would, in 1983, have understood the proposed modification to have been described independently of any suggestion to alter the arginine [sic] residue at position 81 of mature human immune interferon." The examiner maintained this position in his Answer. In his Answer, the examiner stated that

the Wall Declaration does not suggest that the written description in the specification supports an interferon-gamma which must have the claimed structure. Indeed, the number of possible interferon-gamma analogs encompassed by the written description of the invention is substantial and the specification does not lead to any compound which must have the claimed structure.

As already seen, the Board adopted as its own the examiner's response to Alton's arguments.

We express no opinion on the factual question of whether the specification adequately describes the subject matter of claim 70. We do, however, hold that the examiner's final rejection and Answer contained two errors: (1) viewing the Wall declaration as opinion evidence addressing a question of law rather than a question of fact; and (2) the summary dismissal of the declaration without an adequate explanation of why the declaration failed to rebut the Board's prima facie case of inadequate description.

### III.

#### A. The Examiner Erred by Mistaking a Question of Fact for a Question of Law

*See Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1604, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("The conception of a DNA sequence requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties; ... then a description also requires that degree of specificity.")

37 USPQ2d

In re Alton

1583

As was shown, in his final rejection, the examiner stated that the weight given to Dr. Wall's declaration

depended on whether it presents allegations, opinions or facts. In this case the Declaration does not point to inherent support or evidence to support the conclusory statement in paragraph 99. Little weight is given an opinion affidavit on the ultimate legal question of itself.

In his answer, the examiner continued that "[i]t is apparently the 'opinion' emphasis added by Dr. Wall that, as of the filing date of this application, one skilled in the art would have interpreted the specific disclosure as a class of interfacial analogs lacking the eyes-on-eye residues at the amino terminus." Little weight is given an opinion affidavit on the ultimate legal question at issue regarding written description for the invention now claimed.

[I]t is well settled that the question of whether a specification provides an adequate written description of the subject matter of the claims is an issue of fact. Therefore, the examiner was in error when he stated that the Wall declaration, which attempted to shed light on whether the [45] specification adequately described the subject matter of claim 70, addressed a legal issue.

Additionally, the examiner interpreted the Wall declaration as offering opinion evidence, rather than factual evidence, on the adequate written description issue. The Wall declaration's assertion that "[m]odifying the residue at position 81 would have no effect on [disulfide bridge formation] because neither [proteins] nor [lysins] can participate in disulfide bridge formation" is a factual statement, however. So too is the statement that obviating the amino acid at position 81 would involve a modification in subunit 1B2, "requir[ing] an entirely separate series of manipulations of the complete [amino acid] sequence to generate this different class of analogs." We do not read the declaration as asserting an opinion on the patentability of the claimed 1B2 analog. Rather, the declaration is offering factual evidence in an attempt to explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the specification to describe the modification involving the deletion of the first three analog acids independently of the modification at position 81. Dr. Wall's use of the words "it is my opinion" to preface what someone of ordinary skill in the art would have known does not transform the factual statements contained in the declara-

tion into opinion testimony." Consequently, the examiner's dismissal of the declaration on the grounds that "[i]t little weight is given an opinion affidavit on the ultimate legal question at issue" was error.

# B. The Examiner Erred by Failing to Articulate Adequate Support for the Rejection

The examiner also erred by dismissing the Wall declaration without an adequate explanation of how the declaration failed to overcome the prima facie case initially established by the Board. The rejection on the ground that the application failed to describe the subject matter of claim 70. The examiner (or the Board, if the Board is the first body to raise a "particular ground for rejection") "bears the initial burden . . . of presenting a prima facie case of unpatentability." *In re Oetiker*, 579 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1978). Insofar as the written description requirement is concerned, this burden is discharged by "presenting evidence or reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims." *Wertheim*, 541 F.2d at 263, 191 USPQ at 93. Thus, the burden placed on the examiner varies, depending upon what the applicant claims. If the applicant claims embodiments of the invention that are completely outside the scope of the specification, then the examiner or Board need only establish this fact to make out a prima facie case. *Id.* at 263-64, 191 USPQ at 97. If, on the other hand, the specification contains a description of the claimed invention, albeit not *in its own words* (in the identical words), then the examiner or Board, in order to meet the burden of proof, must provide reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider the description sufficient. *Id.* at 264, 191 USPQ at 98. Once the examiner or Board carries the burden of making out a prima facie case of unpatentability, "the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shifts to the applicant." *Oetiker*, 577 F.2d at 1445, 24 USPQ2d at 1444. To overcome a prima facie case, an applicant must show that the invention as claimed is adequately described by

"In any event, we are aware of no reason why opinion evidence, relating to a fact issue should not be considered by an examiner. See *Adkins Oilfield v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 726 F.2d 281, 294, 222 USPQ 629, 664 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1985).

inventor's  
signature

BOARD W95E 111 0003 2003

1584

In re Alton

37 USPQ2d

one skilled in the art. "After evidence or argument is submitted by the applicant in response, patentability is determined on the totality of the record, by a preponderance of the evidence with due consideration to persuasiveness of argument." *Id.* at 1445, 24 USPQ2d at 1444.

"After claim 70 was first rejected on section 112, 1st grounds, Alton submitted evidence to rebut the rejection in the form of the Wall declaration." The Wall declaration contained statements of fact directly addressing the issue of whether the specification adequately described the subject matter recited in claim 70. The purpose of the adequate written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter at the time the application was filed. If a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the inventor to have been in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing, even if every nuance of the claims is not explicitly described in the specification, then the adequate written description requirement is met. For example, in *Ballston Paving Co. v. Far-Mar Co., Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1576, 227 USPQ 177, 180 (Fed. Cir. 1985), the trial court "admitted 'expert testimony' about known industry standards regarding temperature and pressure in 'the art of extrusion of both farinaceous and proteinaceous vegetable materials.'" The effect of the testimony was to "expand the breadth of 'the' so-called written description since it was apparent that the inventor possessed such knowledge of industry standards of temperature and pressure at the time the original application was filed. Similarly, the Wall declaration to essence attempts to expand the breadth of the specification by arguing that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the two modifications in Example 5 of the specification to be described independently of each other and thus a description of both modifications would include a description of either separately.

The thrust of the examiner's response to the Wall declaration, in both the final rejection and the Answer, is that the specification must describe the precise analog claimed. This explains why the examiner stated that the Wall declaration was inadequate because it did not "suggest that the written description in the specification supports an

interferon-gamma analog which must have the claimed structure." This argument, however, does not address the point that paragraph 91 of the Wall declaration attempts to make; that one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the application to describe the two modifications ([met-<sup>1</sup>-des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup> and lys<sup>1</sup>) independently and that the description of both modifications together would be relevant as an example of only one of these modifications ([met-<sup>1</sup>-des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>)). Thus, according to the Wall declaration, the specification would be understood to describe the relevant modification ([met-<sup>1</sup>-des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>]) without the irrelevant one (lys<sup>1</sup>). Therefore, according to the Wall declaration, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand Alton to be in possession, in 1983, of the claimed subject matter, which contained the [met-<sup>1</sup>-des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>, des-cyt<sup>1</sup>] modification but not the modification at position 81.

[2] The Wall declaration addresses why the claimed subject matter, although not identical to the analog described in the specification, was in Alton's possession. The statement in the examiner's answer that the number of possible analogs encompassed by the specification is substantial does not rebut the thrust of the Wall declaration because the Wall declaration explains why one of ordinary skill in the art would have realized that Alton had possession of one particular analog. In sum, in his final rejection and again in his Answer, the examiner dismissed the Wall declaration and provided only conclusory statements as to why the declaration did not show that a person skilled in the art would realize that Alton had possession of the claimed subject matter in 1983.

#### CONCLUSION

First, by concluding that the Wall declaration addressed an issue of law instead of an issue of fact, and second, by failing to articulate adequate reasons to rebut the Wall declaration, the examiner and Board failed to consider the totality of the record for the purpose of issuing a final rejection and thus erred as a matter of law. We are not in a position, however, to determine whether the application contained an adequate written description of the claimed IFN- $\gamma$  sequence. That determination requires, in the first instance, further proceedings in which the Wall declaration is addressed in a manner that is consistent with this opinion. The case is remanded to the Board for such further proceedings. See *In*

"We are satisfied that the Board met its prima facie case of establishing lack of adequate written description in its February 28, 1994 decision by discussing Example 5 of the specification, in which both modifications appeared together."

37 USPO24

Rolex Watch U.S.A. Inc. v. Crowley

1385

to Beaver, 893 R.2d 328, 13 USPO24 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (quoting Board's decision for failing to review all the appealed claims and for agreeing with the Board's regulatory).

COSTS

Each side to pay its own costs.  
VACATED and REMANDED.

## ATTACHMENT A

10  
15  
20  
25  
30  
35  
40  
45  
50  
55  
60  
65  
70  
75  
80  
85  
90  
95  
100  
105  
110  
115  
120  
125  
130  
135  
140  
145  
150  
155  
160  
165  
170  
175  
180  
185  
190  
195  
200  
205  
210  
215  
220  
225  
230  
235  
240  
245  
250  
255  
260  
265  
270  
275  
280  
285  
290  
295  
300  
305  
310  
315  
320  
325  
330  
335  
340  
345  
350  
355  
360  
365  
370  
375  
380  
385  
390  
395  
400  
405  
410  
415  
420  
425  
430  
435  
440  
445  
450  
455  
460  
465  
470  
475  
480  
485  
490  
495  
500  
505  
510  
515  
520  
525  
530  
535  
540  
545  
550  
555  
560  
565  
570  
575  
580  
585  
590  
595  
600  
605  
610  
615  
620  
625  
630  
635  
640  
645  
650  
655  
660  
665  
670  
675  
680  
685  
690  
695  
700  
705  
710  
715  
720  
725  
730  
735  
740  
745  
750  
755  
760  
765  
770  
775  
780  
785  
790  
795  
800  
805  
810  
815  
820  
825  
830  
835  
840  
845  
850  
855  
860  
865  
870  
875  
880  
885  
890  
895  
900  
905  
910  
915  
920  
925  
930  
935  
940  
945  
950  
955  
960  
965  
970  
975  
980  
985  
990  
995  
1000  
1005  
1010  
1015  
1020  
1025  
1030  
1035  
1040  
1045  
1050  
1055  
1060  
1065  
1070  
1075  
1080  
1085  
1090  
1095  
1100  
1105  
1110  
1115  
1120  
1125  
1130  
1135  
1140  
1145  
1150  
1155  
1160  
1165  
1170  
1175  
1180  
1185  
1190  
1195  
1200  
1205  
1210  
1215  
1220  
1225  
1230  
1235  
1240  
1245  
1250  
1255  
1260  
1265  
1270  
1275  
1280  
1285  
1290  
1295  
1300  
1305  
1310  
1315  
1320  
1325  
1330  
1335  
1340  
1345  
1350  
1355  
1360  
1365  
1370  
1375  
1380  
1385  
1390  
1395  
1400  
1405  
1410  
1415  
1420  
1425  
1430  
1435  
1440  
1445  
1450  
1455  
1460  
1465  
1470  
1475  
1480  
1485  
1490  
1495  
1500  
1505  
1510  
1515  
1520  
1525  
1530  
1535  
1540  
1545  
1550  
1555  
1560  
1565  
1570  
1575  
1580  
1585  
1590  
1595  
1600  
1605  
1610  
1615  
1620  
1625  
1630  
1635  
1640  
1645  
1650  
1655  
1660  
1665  
1670  
1675  
1680  
1685  
1690  
1695  
1700  
1705  
1710  
1715  
1720  
1725  
1730  
1735  
1740  
1745  
1750  
1755  
1760  
1765  
1770  
1775  
1780  
1785  
1790  
1795  
1800  
1805  
1810  
1815  
1820  
1825  
1830  
1835  
1840  
1845  
1850  
1855  
1860  
1865  
1870  
1875  
1880  
1885  
1890  
1895  
1900  
1905  
1910  
1915  
1920  
1925  
1930  
1935  
1940  
1945  
1950  
1955  
1960  
1965  
1970  
1975  
1980  
1985  
1990  
1995  
2000  
2005  
2010  
2015  
2020  
2025  
2030  
2035  
2040  
2045  
2050  
2055  
2060  
2065  
2070  
2075  
2080  
2085  
2090  
2095  
2100  
2105  
2110  
2115  
2120  
2125  
2130  
2135  
2140  
2145  
2150  
2155  
2160  
2165  
2170  
2175  
2180  
2185  
2190  
2195  
2200  
2205  
2210  
2215  
2220  
2225  
2230  
2235  
2240  
2245  
2250  
2255  
2260  
2265  
2270  
2275  
2280  
2285  
2290  
2295  
2300  
2305  
2310  
2315  
2320  
2325  
2330  
2335  
2340  
2345  
2350  
2355  
2360  
2365  
2370  
2375  
2380  
2385  
2390  
2395  
2400  
2405  
2410  
2415  
2420  
2425  
2430  
2435  
2440  
2445  
2450  
2455  
2460  
2465  
2470  
2475  
2480  
2485  
2490  
2495  
2500  
2505  
2510  
2515  
2520  
2525  
2530  
2535  
2540  
2545  
2550  
2555  
2560  
2565  
2570  
2575  
2580  
2585  
2590  
2595  
2600  
2605  
2610  
2615  
2620  
2625  
2630  
2635  
2640  
2645  
2650  
2655  
2660  
2665  
2670  
2675  
2680  
2685  
2690  
2695  
2700  
2705  
2710  
2715  
2720  
2725  
2730  
2735  
2740  
2745  
2750  
2755  
2760  
2765  
2770  
2775  
2780  
2785  
2790  
2795  
2800  
2805  
2810  
2815  
2820  
2825  
2830  
2835  
2840  
2845  
2850  
2855  
2860  
2865  
2870  
2875  
2880  
2885  
2890  
2895  
2900  
2905  
2910  
2915  
2920  
2925  
2930  
2935  
2940  
2945  
2950  
2955  
2960  
2965  
2970  
2975  
2980  
2985  
2990  
2995  
3000  
3005  
3010  
3015  
3020  
3025  
3030  
3035  
3040  
3045  
3050  
3055  
3060  
3065  
3070  
3075  
3080  
3085  
3090  
3095  
3100  
3105  
3110  
3115  
3120  
3125  
3130  
3135  
3140  
3145  
3150  
3155  
3160  
3165  
3170  
3175  
3180  
3185  
3190  
3195  
3200  
3205  
3210  
3215  
3220  
3225  
3230  
3235  
3240  
3245  
3250  
3255  
3260  
3265  
3270  
3275  
3280  
3285  
3290  
3295  
3300  
3305  
3310  
3315  
3320  
3325  
3330  
3335  
3340  
3345  
3350  
3355  
3360  
3365  
3370  
3375  
3380  
3385  
3390  
3395  
3400  
3405  
3410  
3415  
3420  
3425  
3430  
3435  
3440  
3445  
3450  
3455  
3460  
3465  
3470  
3475  
3480  
3485  
3490  
3495  
3500  
3505  
3510  
3515  
3520  
3525  
3530  
3535  
3540  
3545  
3550  
3555  
3560  
3565  
3570  
3575  
3580  
3585  
3590  
3595  
3600  
3605  
3610  
3615  
3620  
3625  
3630  
3635  
3640  
3645  
3650  
3655  
3660  
3665  
3670  
3675  
3680  
3685  
3690  
3695  
3700  
3705  
3710  
3715  
3720  
3725  
3730  
3735  
3740  
3745  
3750  
3755  
3760  
3765  
3770  
3775  
3780  
3785  
3790  
3795  
3800  
3805  
3810  
3815  
3820  
3825  
3830  
3835  
3840  
3845  
3850  
3855  
3860  
3865  
3870  
3875  
3880  
3885  
3890  
3895  
3900  
3905  
3910  
3915  
3920  
3925  
3930  
3935  
3940  
3945  
3950  
3955  
3960  
3965  
3970  
3975  
3980  
3985  
3990  
3995  
4000  
4005  
4010  
4015  
4020  
4025  
4030  
4035  
4040  
4045  
4050  
4055  
4060  
4065  
4070  
4075  
4080  
4085  
4090  
4095  
4100  
4105  
4110  
4115  
4120  
4125  
4130  
4135  
4140  
4145  
4150  
4155  
4160  
4165  
4170  
4175  
4180  
4185  
4190  
4195  
4200  
4205  
4210  
4215  
4220  
4225  
4230  
4235  
4240  
4245  
4250  
4255  
4260  
4265  
4270  
4275  
4280  
4285  
4290  
4295  
4300  
4305  
4310  
4315  
4320  
4325  
4330  
4335  
4340  
4345  
4350  
4355  
4360  
4365  
4370  
4375  
4380  
4385  
4390  
4395  
4400  
4405  
4410  
4415  
4420  
4425  
4430  
4435  
4440  
4445  
4450  
4455  
4460  
4465  
4470  
4475  
4480  
4485  
4490  
4495  
4500  
4505  
4510  
4515  
4520  
4525  
4530  
4535  
4540  
4545  
4550  
4555  
4560  
4565  
4570  
4575  
4580  
4585  
4590  
4595  
4600  
4605  
4610  
4615  
4620  
4625  
4630  
4635  
4640  
4645  
4650  
4655  
4660  
4665  
4670  
4675  
4680  
4685  
4690  
4695  
4700  
4705  
4710  
4715  
4720  
4725  
4730  
4735  
4740  
4745  
4750  
4755  
4760  
4765  
4770  
4775  
4780  
4785  
4790  
4795  
4800  
4805  
4810  
4815  
4820  
4825  
4830  
4835  
4840  
4845  
4850  
4855  
4860  
4865  
4870  
4875  
4880  
4885  
4890  
4895  
4900  
4905  
4910  
4915  
4920  
4925  
4930  
4935  
4940  
4945  
4950  
4955  
4960  
4965  
4970  
4975  
4980  
4985  
4990  
4995  
5000  
5005  
5010  
5015  
5020  
5025  
5030  
5035  
5040  
5045  
5050  
5055  
5060  
5065  
5070  
5075  
5080  
5085  
5090  
5095  
5100  
5105  
5110  
5115  
5120  
5125  
5130  
5135  
5140  
5145  
5150  
5155  
5160  
5165  
5170  
5175  
5180  
5185  
5190  
5195  
5200  
5205  
5210  
5215  
5220  
5225  
5230  
5235  
5240  
5245  
5250  
5255  
5260  
5265  
5270  
5275  
5280  
5285  
5290  
5295  
5300  
5305  
5310  
5315  
5320  
5325  
5330  
5335  
5340  
5345  
5350  
5355  
5360  
5365  
5370  
5375  
5380  
5385  
5390  
5395  
5400  
5405  
5410  
5415  
5420  
5425  
5430  
5435  
5440  
5445  
5450  
5455  
5460  
5465  
5470  
5475  
5480  
5485  
5490  
5495  
5500  
5505  
5510  
5515  
5520  
5525  
5530  
5535  
5540  
5545  
5550  
5555  
5560  
5565  
5570  
5575  
5580  
5585  
5590  
5595  
5600  
5605  
5610  
5615  
5620  
5625  
5630  
5635  
5640  
5645  
5650  
5655  
5660  
5665  
5670  
5675  
5680  
5685  
5690  
5695  
5700  
5705  
5710  
5715  
5720  
5725  
5730  
5735  
5740  
5745  
5750  
5755  
5760  
5765  
5770  
5775  
5780  
5785  
5790  
5795  
5800  
5805  
5810  
5815  
5820  
5825  
5830  
5835  
5840  
5845  
5850  
5855  
5860  
5865  
5870  
5875  
5880  
5885  
5890  
5895  
5900  
5905  
5910  
5915  
5920  
5925  
5930  
5935  
5940  
5945  
5950  
5955  
5960  
5965  
5970  
5975  
5980  
5985  
5990  
5995  
6000  
6005  
6010  
6015  
6020  
6025  
6030  
6035  
6040  
6045  
6050  
6055  
6060  
6065  
6070  
6075  
6080  
6085  
6090  
6095  
6100  
6105  
6110  
6115  
6120  
6125  
6130  
6135  
6140  
6145  
6150  
6155  
6160  
6165  
6170  
6175  
6180  
6185  
6190  
6195  
6200  
6205  
6210  
6215  
6220  
6225  
6230  
6235  
6240  
6245  
6250  
6255  
6260  
6265  
6270  
6275  
6280  
6285  
6290  
6295  
6300  
6305  
6310  
6315  
6320  
6325  
6330  
6335  
6340  
6345  
6350  
6355  
6360  
6365  
6370  
6375  
6380  
6385  
6390  
6395  
6400  
6405  
6410  
6415  
6420  
6425  
6430  
6435  
6440  
6445  
6450  
6455  
6460  
6465  
6470  
6475  
6480  
6485  
6490  
6495  
6500  
6505  
6510  
6515  
6520  
6525  
6530  
6535  
6540  
6545  
6550  
6555  
6560  
6565  
6570  
6575  
6580  
6585  
6590  
6595  
6600  
6605  
6610  
6615  
6620  
6625  
6630  
6635  
6640  
6645  
6650  
6655  
6660  
6665  
6670  
6675  
6680  
6685  
6690  
6695  
6700  
6705  
6710  
6715  
6720  
6725  
6730  
6735  
6740  
6745  
6750  
6755  
6760  
6765  
6770  
6775  
6780  
6785  
6790  
6795  
6800  
6805  
6810  
6815  
6820  
6825  
6830  
6835  
6840  
6845  
6850  
6855  
6860  
6865  
6870  
6875  
6880  
6885  
6890  
6895  
6900  
6905  
6910  
6915  
6920  
6925  
6930  
6935  
6940  
6945  
6950  
6955  
6960  
6965  
6970  
6975  
6980  
6985  
6990  
6995  
7000  
7005  
7010  
7015  
7020  
7025  
7030  
7035  
7040  
7045  
7050  
7055  
7060  
7065  
7070  
7075  
7080  
7085  
7090  
7095  
7100  
7105  
7110  
7115  
7120  
7125  
7130  
7135  
7140  
7145  
7150  
7155  
7160  
7165  
7170  
7175  
7180  
7185  
7190  
7195  
7200  
7205  
7210  
7215  
7220  
7225  
7230  
7235  
7240  
7245  
7250  
7255  
7260  
7265  
7270  
7275  
7280  
7285  
7290  
7295  
7300  
7305  
7310  
7315  
7320  
7325  
7330  
7335  
7340  
7345  
7350  
7355  
7360  
7365  
7370  
7375  
7380  
7385  
7390  
7395  
7400  
7405  
7410  
7415  
7420  
7425  
7430  
7435  
7440  
7445  
7450  
7455  
7460  
7465  
7470  
7475  
7480  
7485  
7490  
7495  
7500  
7505  
7510  
7515  
7520  
7525  
7530  
7535  
7540  
7545  
7550  
7555  
7560  
7565  
7570  
7575  
7580  
7585  
7590  
7595  
7600  
7605  
7610  
7615  
7620  
7625  
7630  
7635  
7640  
7645  
7650  
7655  
7660  
7665  
7670  
7675  
7680  
7685  
7690  
7695  
7700  
7705  
7710  
7715  
7720  
7725  
7730  
7735  
7740  
7745  
7750  
7755  
7760  
7765  
7770  
7775  
7780  
7785  
7790  
7795  
7800  
7805  
7810  
7815  
7820  
7825  
7830  
7835  
7840  
7845  
7850  
7855  
7860  
7865  
7870  
7875  
7880  
7885  
7890  
7895  
7900  
7905  
7910  
7915  
7920  
7925  
7930  
7935  
7940  
7945  
7950  
7955  
7960  
7965  
7970  
7975  
7980  
7985  
7990  
7995  
8000  
8005  
8010  
8015  
8020  
8025  
8030  
8035  
8040  
8045  
8050  
8055  
8060  
8065  
8070  
8075  
8080  
8085  
8090  
8095  
8100  
8105  
8110  
8115  
8120  
8125  
8130  
8135  
8140  
8145  
8150  
8155  
8160  
8165  
8170  
8175  
8180  
8185  
8190  
8195  
8200  
8205  
8210  
8215  
8220  
8225  
8230  
8235  
8240  
8245  
8250  
8255  
8260  
8265  
8270  
8275  
8280  
8285  
8290  
8295  
8300  
8305  
8310  
8315  
8320  
8325  
8330  
8335  
8340  
8345  
8350  
8355  
8360  
8365  
8370  
8375  
8380  
8385  
8390  
8395  
8400  
8405  
8410  
8415  
8420  
8425  
8430  
8435  
8440  
8445  
8450  
8455  
8460  
8465  
8470  
8475  
8480  
8485  
8490  
8495  
8500  
8505  
8510  
8515  
8520  
8525  
8530  
8535  
8540  
8545  
8550  
8555  
8560  
8565  
8570  
8575  
8580  
8585  
8590  
8595  
8600  
8605  
8610  
8615  
8620  
8625  
8630  
8635  
8640  
8645  
8650  
8655  
8660  
8665  
8670  
8675  
8680  
8685  
8690  
8695  
8700  
8705  
8710  
8715  
8720  
8725  
8730  
8735  
8740  
8745  
8750  
8755  
8760  
8765  
8770  
8775  
8780  
8785  
8790  
8795  
8800  
8805  
8810  
8815  
8820  
8825  
8830  
8835  
8840  
8845  
8850  
8855  
8860  
8865  
8870  
8875  
8880  
8885  
8890  
8895  
8900  
8905  
8910  
8915  
8920  
8925  
8930  
8935  
8940  
8945  
8950  
8955  
8960  
8965  
8970  
8975  
8980  
8985  
8990  
8995  
9000  
9005  
9010  
9015  
9020  
9025  
9030  
9035  
9040  
9045  
9050  
9055  
9060  
9065  
9070  
9075  
9080  
9085  
9090  
9095  
9100  
9105  
9110  
9115  
9120  
9125  
9130  
9135  
9140  
9145  
9150  
9155  
9160  
9165  
9170  
9175  
9180  
9185  
9190  
9195  
9200  
9205  
9210  
9215  
9220  
9225  
9230  
9235  
9240  
9245  
9250  
9255  
9260  
9265  
9270  
9275  
9280  
9285  
9290  
9295  
9300  
9305  
9310  
9315  
9320  
9325  
9330  
9335  
9340  
9345  
9350  
9355  
9360  
9365  
9370  
9375  
9380  
9385  
9390  
9395  
9400  
9405  
9410  
9415  
9420  
9425  
9430  
9435  
9440  
9445  
9450  
9455  
9460  
9465  
9470  
9475  
9480  
9485  
9490  
9495  
9500  
9505  
9510  
9515  
9520  
9525  
9530  
9535  
9540  
9545  
9550  
9555  
9560  
9565  
9570  
9575  
9580  
9585  
9590  
9595  
9600  
9605  
9610  
9615  
9620  
9625  
9630  
9635  
9640  
9645  
9650  
9655  
9660  
9665  
9670  
9675  
9680  
9685  
9690  
9695  
9700  
9705  
9710  
9715  
9720  
9725  
9730  
9735  
9740  
9745  
9750  
9755  
9760  
9765  
9770  
9775  
9780  
9785  
9790  
9795  
9800  
9805  
9810  
9815  
9820  
9825  
9830  
9835  
9840  
9845  
9850  
9855  
9860  
9865  
9870  
9875  
9880  
9885  
9890  
9895  
9900  
9905  
9910  
9915  
9920  
9925  
9930  
9935  
9940  
9945  
9950  
9955  
9960  
9965  
9970  
9975  
9980  
9985  
9990  
9995  
10000  
10005  
10010  
10015  
10020  
10025  
10030  
10035  
10040  
10045  
10050  
10055  
10060  
10065  
10070  
10075  
10080  
10085  
10090  
10095  
10100  
10105  
10110  
10115  
10120  
10125  
10130  
1



\* \* \* TRANSMISSION RESULT REPORT ( OCT.29.2003 4:46PM ) \* \* \*

TTI K10B

DATE	TIME	ADDRESS	MODE	TIME	PAGE	RESULT	PER. NAME	FILE
OCT.29.	4:35PM		USPTO TES	10'53"	P.19	OK		919

\* : BATCH  
 \* : MEMORY  
 \* : STANDARD

C : CONFIDENTIAL  
 L : SEND LATER  
 D : DETAIL

\* : TRANSFER  
 \* : FORWARDING  
 \* : FINE

P : POLLING  
 F : ECM  
 > : REDUCTION